Concurrence of Superpositions

Chang-shui Yu, X. X. Yi, and He-shan Song*
Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, China
(Dated: April 1, 2022)

The bounds on concurrence of the superposition state in terms of those of the states being superposed are studied in this paper. The bounds on concurrence are quite different from those on the entanglement measure based on von Neumann entropy (Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 100502 (2006)). In particular, a *nonzero* lower bound can be provided if the states being superposed are properly constrained.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud

arXiv:quant-ph/0610219v1 26 Oct 2006

Most recently, Linden et al [1] have raised a problem, i.e. what is the relation between the entanglement of two given states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ of two parties A and B and that of their superposed state $|\Gamma\rangle = \alpha|\Psi\rangle + \beta|\Phi\rangle$, with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. They have found upper bounds on the entanglement $|\Gamma\rangle$ in terms of the entanglement of $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$, where the entanglement measure they employed is the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state of either of the parties [2] defined by

$$E(\Psi) = S(\mathrm{Tr}_A |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) = S(\mathrm{Tr}_B |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|).$$

Since the entanglement measure for pure states is not unique, it is natural to ask whether the bounds obtained in Ref. [1] only exist for von Neumann entropy? Motivated by this question, in the paper we employ concurrence [3,4,5] as the entanglement measure to study how the concurrence of $|\Gamma\rangle$ is bounded by the concurrence of $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$. The result shows that bounds on entanglement of superposition depend on the entanglement measure. Even though the form of the bounds for concurrence are something like those given in Ref. [1], they are quite different. For example, for two biorthogonal states, Ref. [1] has shown an elegant bound for the von Neumann entropy of their superposition, i.e. an equality bound, while there do not exist explicit constraints for the two states such that the concurrence of their superposition has equality bounds. It is the most important that a *nonzero* lower bound on the concurrence of a superposition state can be provided if the states being superposed satisfy some conditions which includes the constraints on the concurrence of the states and the their proportions in the superposition state and so on. The paper is organized as follows. First, we introduce an variational but equivalent expression for concurrence; Then we study the concurrence of superposition by the analogous logic to that of Ref. [1]; The conclusion is drawn at last.

In this paragraph, we first introduce the concurrence and derive the variational form of concurrence which will simplify our presentation. As we know, $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ of two parties A and B defined in $(n_1 \times n_2)$ dimension can, in general, be considered as a vector, i.e. $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = [a_{00}, a_{01}, \cdots, a_{0n_2}, a_{10}, a_{11}, \cdots, a_{n_1n_2}]^T$ with superscript T denoting transpose operation, while throughout of the paper we confine all the pure states to matrix notation, i.e.

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} a_{00} & a_{01} & \cdots & a_{0n_2} \\ a_{10} & a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1n_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n_10} & a_{n_11} & \cdots & a_{n_1n_2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

With the matrix notation, one can easily find that the reduced density matrix

$$\rho_B = \psi\psi^\dagger. \quad (2)$$

Consider the eigenvalue decomposition of ρ_B, one can have

$$\rho_B = \psi\psi^\dagger = \Psi M \Psi^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

where the columns of Ψ correspond to the eigenvectors of ρ_B and M is a non-negative diagonal matrix with its diagonal entries corresponding to the eigenvalues of ρ_B or the square of the singular values of ψ.

The concurrence for an arbitrary dimensional bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is defined [4] by

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{1 - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_r^2)}, \quad (4)$$

which turned out to be the length of the concurrence vector by Wootters [6], where $\rho_r = Tr_\alpha |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ denoting the reduced density matrix tracing over either of the two parties. Substitute eq. (3) into eq. (4), we have

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{1 - \sum_i \sigma_i^4} \quad (5)$$

$$= \sqrt{\sum_{i\neq j} \sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}, \quad (6)$$

where σ_i, $\sum_i \sigma_i^2 = 1$, is one singular value of ψ where the normalized ψ is always implied. Eq. (5) and eq. (6) are the so-called variational forms for concurrence to be used in the paper.

*Electronic address: hssong@dlut.edu.cn

Theorem 1: If the two pure states Ψ_1 and Φ_1 defined in $(n \times m)$ dimension satisfy $\Psi_1\Phi_1^\dagger = 0$, the concurrence of their superposed states $\Gamma_1^+ = \alpha\Psi_1 + \beta\Phi_1$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$, obeys

$$\frac{|\alpha|^2 C(\Psi_1) + |\beta|^2 C(\Phi_1)}{2} \leq C(\alpha\Psi_1 + \beta\Phi_1)$$

$$\leq \frac{|\alpha|^2 \tilde{C}(\Psi_1, \alpha) + |\beta|^2 \tilde{C}(\Phi_1, \beta)}{2}, \qquad (7)$$

where

$$\tilde{C}(\Psi_1, \alpha) = \sqrt{C^2(\Psi_1) + \frac{|\beta|^4}{|\alpha|^4} + 2\frac{|\beta|^2}{|\alpha|^2}}, \qquad (8)$$

with $|\beta|^2 = 1 - |\alpha|^2$.

That we say Ψ_1 and Φ_1 defined in the same dimension implies that the two states have been properly adjusted. Note that Ψ_1 and Φ_1 may be defined in the Hilbert space with different dimensions. However, one can always add some zero entries to Ψ_1 and Φ_1 such that Ψ_1 and Φ_1 are defined in the same dimension.

Proof: As we know, for any two Hermitian matrix H and K defined in $C^{n\times n}$,

$$\lambda_i(H) + \lambda_1(K) \leq \lambda_i(H + K) \leq \lambda_i(H) + \lambda_n(K) \qquad (9)$$

holds, where $\lambda_i(\cdot)$ denotes the eigenvalues in increasing order [7] (See **Theorem 4.3.1** in Ref. [7]).

Since $\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger$ and $\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger$ are both Hermitian and defined in $(n \times n)$ dimension, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |\alpha|^2 \lambda_i(\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger) + |\beta|^2 \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger) \\ \leq\ & \lambda_i(|\alpha|^2 \Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger + |\beta|^2 \Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger). \end{aligned} \qquad (10)$$

Because $\Psi_1\Phi_1^\dagger = 0$,

$$\lambda_i(|\alpha|^2 \Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger + |\beta|^2 \Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger) = \lambda_i\left(\Gamma_1^+ \left(\Gamma_1^+\right)^\dagger\right). \qquad (11)$$

Substitute eq. (11) into eq. (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{\sum_{i\neq j}^{n} \left[|\alpha|^2 \lambda_i(\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger) + |\beta|^2 \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger)\right]\right. \\ & \left. \times \left[|\alpha|^2 \lambda_j(\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger) + |\beta|^2 \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger)\right]\right\}^{1/2} \\ =\ & \left\{|\alpha|^4 C^2(\Psi_1) + (n-1)|\beta|^2 \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger)\right. \\ & \left. \times \left[2|\alpha|^2 + n|\beta|^2 \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger)\right]\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq\ & \sqrt{\sum_{i\neq j}^{n} \lambda_i\left(\Gamma_1^+\left(\Gamma_1^+\right)\right)\lambda_j\left(\Gamma_1^+\left(\Gamma_1^+\right)\right)} = C(\Gamma_1^+). \end{aligned} \qquad (12)$$

Substitute eq. (11) into eq. (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(\Gamma_1^+) &= \sqrt{1 - \sum_{i}^{n} \lambda_i^2\left(\Gamma_1^+\left(\Gamma_1^+\right)\right)} \\ &\leq \left[|\alpha|^4 (1 - \sum_{i}^{n} \lambda_i^2(\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger)) + |\beta|^4 (1 - n\lambda_1^2(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger))\right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2 (1 - \lambda_1 \sum_{i}^{n} \lambda_i(\Psi_1\Psi_1^\dagger))\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left[|\alpha|^4 C^2(\Psi_1) + |\beta|^4 (1 - n\lambda_1^2(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger))\right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2 (1 - \lambda_1(\Phi_1\Phi_1^\dagger))\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \qquad (13)$$

Simplifying eq. (12) and eq. (13) by considering the positive semidefinite $\Phi\Phi^\dagger$, the two equations can be rewritten by

$$|\alpha|^2 C(\Psi_1) \leq C(\alpha\Psi_1 + \beta\Phi_1) \leq \sqrt{|\alpha|^4 C^2(\Psi_1) + |\beta|^4 + 2|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2}. \qquad (14)$$

Consider the analogous relation to eq. (9) by exchanging H and K and the positive semidefinite $\Psi\Psi^\dagger$, based on the above procedure one can also obtain

$$|\beta|^2 C(\Phi_1) \leq C(\alpha\Psi_1 + \beta\Phi_1) \leq \sqrt{|\beta|^4 C^2(\Phi_1) + |\alpha|^4 + 2|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2}. \qquad (15)$$

Therefore, eq. (14) and eq. (15) can be given in a symmetric form by

$$\frac{|\alpha|^2 C(\Psi_1) + |\beta|^2 C(\Phi_1)}{2} \leq C(\alpha\Psi_1 + \beta\Phi_1)$$

$$\leq \frac{|\alpha|^2 \tilde{C}(\Psi_1, \alpha) + |\beta|^2 \tilde{C}(\Phi_1, \beta)}{2}, \qquad (16)$$

which completes the proof.□

Theorem 2: If $(n \times m)$-dimensional pure states Φ_2 and Ψ_2 are orthogonal, i.e. $\mathrm{Tr}\Psi_2\Phi_2^\dagger = 0$, the concurrence of their superposed state $\Gamma_2^+ = \alpha\Psi_2 + \beta\Phi_2$ with rank r satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[|\alpha|^2 l(\alpha, \Psi_2, \Phi_2) + |\beta|^2 l(\beta, \Phi_2, \Psi_2)\right] \\ \leq\ & 2\max\{|\alpha|^2 l(\alpha, \Psi_2, \Phi_2), |\beta|^2 l(\beta, \Phi_2, \Psi_2)\} \\ \leq\ & C(\Gamma_2^+) \leq 2\min\{|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha, \Psi_2, \Phi_2), |\beta|^2 f(\beta, \Phi_2, \Psi_2)\} \\ \leq\ & \left[|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha, \Psi_2, \Phi_2) + |\beta|^2 f(\beta, \Phi_2, \Psi_2)\right], \end{aligned} \qquad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & l(\alpha, \Psi_2, \Phi_2) \\ =\ & \left[\max\{0,\ C^2(\Psi_2) + \frac{|\beta|^4}{|\alpha|^4}\left[1 - r\lambda_n^2(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\right]\right. \\ & \left. + 2\frac{|\beta|^2}{|\alpha|^2}\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger) - \frac{3}{4|\alpha|^4}\right\}\Bigg]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2) = \left\{C^2(\Psi_2)+(r-1)\frac{|\beta|^2}{|\alpha|^2}\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger) \times\left[2+r\frac{|\beta|^2}{|\alpha|^2}\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\right]\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Construct matrix D_2 such that

$$D_2=\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger+\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger.$$

The inequality (10) holds in this case, too. I.e.

$$\begin{aligned}&|\alpha|^2\lambda_i(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_2(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\\ \le\ &\lambda_i(D_2)\le|\alpha|^2\lambda_i(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\end{aligned}\quad(18)$$

D_2 can also be rewritten as

$$D_2=\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger+\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger,\quad(19)$$

with $\Gamma_2^-=\alpha\Psi_2-\beta\Phi_2$. In terms of inequality (9), eq. (19) follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i\left(\left(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger\right)+\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger)\\ \le\ &\lambda_i(D_2)\le\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)+\frac{1}{2}\lambda_n(\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger).\end{aligned}\quad(20)$$

Comparing eq. (18) with eq. (20), one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)+\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger)\\ \le\ &|\alpha|^2\lambda_i(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger),\end{aligned}\quad(21)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)+\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger)\\ \le\ &|\alpha|^2\lambda_n(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_i(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger).\end{aligned}\quad(22)$$

Due to the positive semidefinite $\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger$, $\lambda_1(\Gamma_2^-\left(\Gamma_2^-\right)^\dagger)\geqslant 0$. Eq. (21) and eq. (22) can be rewritten by

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)\le|\alpha|^2\lambda_i(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\quad(23)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)\le|\alpha|^2\lambda_n(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_i(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger).\quad(24)$$

Substitute eq. (23) and eq. (24) into eq. (6), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2}C(\Gamma_2^+)\le|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2)\quad(25)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}C(\Gamma_2^+)\le|\beta|^2 f(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2).\quad(26)$$

Rewriting eq. (25) and eq. (26) in a symmetric form, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}C(\Gamma_2^+)\ &\le\ 2\min\{|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2),|\beta|^2 f(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2)\}\\ &\le\ \left[|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2)+|\beta|^2 f(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2)\right].\end{aligned}\quad(27)$$

According to eq. (5) and eq. (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}C(\Gamma_2^+)=\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{4}\sum_i\lambda_i^2(\Gamma_2^+\left(\Gamma_2^+\right)^\dagger)}\\ \ge\ &\sqrt{\max\left\{0,\frac{1}{4}-\sum_i\left[|\alpha|^2\lambda_i(\Psi_2\Psi_2^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\lambda_n(\Phi_2\Phi_2^\dagger)\right]^2\right\}}\\ =\ &|\alpha|^2 l(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2).\end{aligned}\quad(28)$$

It is obvious that eq. (28) can not always provide a good (*nonzero*) lower bound for all the cases. One can find that if and only if

$$|\beta|^4+|\alpha|^4\left[C^2(\Psi_2)+\frac{1}{r}\right]>\frac{3}{4},\quad(29)$$

there may exist some Φ_2 such that eq. (28) can provide a good lower bound. Analogously, we can also obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}C(\Gamma_2^+)\ge|\beta|^2 l(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2),\quad(30)$$

where a similar condition of Φ_2 to eq. (29) is needed for Ψ_2 to give a good lower bound. Hence, one can obtain a symmetric form

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}C(\Gamma_2^+)\ &\ge\ \max\left\{|\alpha|^2 l(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2),|\beta|^2 l(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2)\right\}\\ &\ge\ \frac{1}{2}\left[|\alpha|^2 l(\alpha,\Psi_2,\Phi_2)+|\beta|^2 l(\beta,\Phi_2,\Psi_2)\right]\end{aligned}\quad(31)$$

A good bound requires that the condition (29) holds at least for one of the states being superposed. □

Theorem 3: For any two normalized $(n\times m)$-dimensional pure states Ψ_3 and Φ_3 with $|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2=1$, the concurrence of the superposed state $\Gamma_3^+=\alpha\Psi_3+\beta\Phi_3$ with rank r is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\left[|\alpha|^2\tilde{l}(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3)+|\beta|^2\tilde{l}(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3)\right]\\ \le\ &\max\left\{|\alpha|^2\tilde{l}(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3),|\beta|^2\tilde{l}(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3)\right\}\\ \le\ &\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}C(\Gamma_3^+)\le\min\{|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3),|\beta|^2 f(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3)\}\\ &\le\frac{1}{2}\left[|\alpha|^2 f(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3)+|\beta|^2 f(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3)\right],\end{aligned}\quad(32)$$

where

$$\tilde{l}\left(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3\right)$$

$$= \left[\max\left\{0,\ C^2\left(\Psi_3\right)+\frac{|\beta|^4}{|\alpha|^4}\left[1-r\lambda_n^2(\Phi_3\Phi_3^\dagger)\right]\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.+2\frac{|\beta|^2}{|\alpha|^2}\lambda_n(\Phi_3\Phi_3^\dagger)-\frac{1}{|\alpha|^4}\left(1-\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^4}{4}\right)\right\}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

Proof. Analogous to theorem 2, consider the matrix

$$D_3=|\alpha|^2\,\Psi_3\Psi_3^\dagger+|\beta|^2\,\Phi_3\Phi_3^\dagger. \tag{33}$$

D_3 can be rewritten as

$$D_3=\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\right)^\dagger+\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^-\right\|^2}{2}\tilde{\Gamma}_3^-\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^-\right)^\dagger, \tag{34}$$

with $\Gamma_3^\pm=\alpha\Psi_3\pm\beta\Phi_3$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_3^\pm=\frac{\Gamma_3^\pm}{\left\|\Gamma_3^\pm\right\|}$. Based on eq. (9), we have

$$\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}\lambda_i\left(\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\right)^\dagger\right)+\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^-\right\|^2}{2}\lambda_1\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^-\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^-\right)^\dagger\right)\right.$$
$$\leq\ \lambda_i(D_3)\leq|\alpha|^2\,\lambda_i\left(\Psi_3\Psi_3^\dagger\right)+|\beta|^2\,\lambda_1\left(\Phi_3\Phi_3^\dagger\right). \tag{35}$$

Following the similar procedure to that of theorem 2, based on eq. (35) one can obtain

$$\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}C\left(\Gamma_3^+\right)\leq\min\{|\alpha|^2\,f\left(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3\right),|\beta|^2\,f\left(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3\right)\}$$

$$\leq\frac{1}{2}\left[|\alpha|^2\,f\left(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3\right)+|\beta|^2\,f\left(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3\right)\right]. \tag{36}$$

Note that $C(\Gamma_3^+)$ means the concurrence of the normalized $\alpha\Psi_3+\beta\Phi_3$, i.e. $C(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+)$. From eq. (5) and eq. (35) again, one has

$$\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}C\left(\Gamma_3^+\right)=\sqrt{\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^4}{4}-\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^4}{4}\lambda_i^2\left(\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_3^+\right)^\dagger\right)\right.}$$
$$\geq\sqrt{\max\left\{0,\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^4}{4}-\sum_i\left[|\alpha|^2\,\lambda_i(\Psi_3\Psi_3^\dagger)+|\beta|^2\,\lambda_n(\Phi_3\Phi_3^\dagger)\right]^2\right\}}$$

$$=|\alpha|^2\,\tilde{l}(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3). \tag{37}$$

Analogously, if and only if

$$|\beta|^4+|\alpha|^4\left[C^2\left(\Psi_3\right)+\frac{1}{r}\right]>1-\frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^4}{4}, \tag{38}$$

there may exist some Φ_3 such that eq. (37) can give a nonzero lower bound. In a symmetric form, the bound on concurrence can be given by

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[|\alpha|^2\,\tilde{l}\left(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3\right)+|\beta|^2\,\tilde{l}\left(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3\right)\right]$$
$$\leq\ \max\left\{|\alpha|^2\,\tilde{l}\left(\alpha,\Psi_3,\Phi_3\right),|\beta|^2\,\tilde{l}\left(\beta,\Phi_3,\Psi_3\right)\right\}$$
$$\leq\ \frac{\left\|\Gamma_3^+\right\|^2}{2}C\left(\Gamma_3^+\right). \tag{39}$$

In order to obtain a good lower bound, the analogous conditions to eq. (29) is needed at least for one of Ψ_3 and Φ_3. Eq. (36) and eq. (37) complete the proof.□

In summary, we have given the bounds on the concurrence of superposition states, which are very different from those in Ref. [1]. A lower bound can also be provided if the states being superposed are constrained as mentioned. However, it seems to be difficult to present a useful lower bound for arbitrary two states by the current approach. As to the superposition of more than two terms, one has to repeat our procedure based on eq. (9). One can easily see that if the current bound on concurrence is converted into that on the square of concurrence (it is only a simple algebra), the generalization to the case of more than two terms will be straight and convenient. What is more, one will see that if the negativity [8] is employed as entanglement measure, it is also difficult to find useful (upper and lower) bounds based on the current approach.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, under Grant Nos. 10575017 and 60472017.

[1] Noah Linden, Sandu Popescu and John A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 100502 (2006).
[2] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).
[3] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[4] Pranaw Rungta, V. Bužek, Carlton M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, Phy.Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001).
[5] K. Audenaert, F.Verstraete and De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052304 (2001)
[6] W. K. Wootters, Quantum Inf. Comp. **1**, 27 (2001).
[7] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985).
[8] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).